

REMARKS

The Official Action of July 14, 2010, made final, and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks. Claims 36-49 have been canceled without prejudice and rewritten for presentation as new Claims 50-62 for convenience in entering this amendment. The definition of R<sup>1</sup> from Claim 37 has been incorporated into new Claim 50. Support for this amendment is found in the Specification, e.g., page 2, line 15 to page 10, line 1, page 14, line 15 to page 19, line 11, and the claims of the application as filed.

Claims 50-62 are pending in the application.

1. Rejection of Claims 36, 40 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 36, 40 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Altenbach et al (US 2005/0256118). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Altenbach et al. does not disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. In particular, Altenbach et al. discloses an isoquinolinyl compound which bears an methyl-pyrrolidinyl-ethyl group at R<sup>1</sup>, a methyl group at R<sup>2</sup>, and a difluorophenyl group at R<sup>3</sup>. In contrast, the present claims as amended to incorporate the groups of R<sup>1</sup> from former Claim 37 do not possess all of these substituents together in a single embodiment. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 36, 40 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Altenbach et al (US 2005/0256118) is untenable and should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 36 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second paragraph

Claims 36 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. The Examiner was concerned regarding the terminology and typographical errors in these claims. Applicants respectfully assert that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that they regard as their invention. In the interest of compact prosecution, however, they have amend the claims in rewriting them as new claims to incorporate the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 36 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness is untenable and should be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 10/590,586  
Case No.: BY0040P  
Page: 6

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that Claims 37 and 38 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and that Claims 41-44 and 46-49 are allowable. In this regard, the limitations of Claim 37 have been incorporated into the main independent Claim 50. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, such claims should be allowed.

Applicants respectfully contend that the application is allowable and a favorable response from the Examiner is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By J. Eric Thies, Reg.# 35382/  
J. Eric Thies  
Reg. No. 35,382  
Attorney for Applicant  
MERCK  
P.O. Box 2000  
Rahway, New Jersey 07065-0907  
(732) 594-3904

Date: October 14, 2010